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Abstract

Lineage tracing, the joint segmentation and tracking of living cells as they move and divide in a sequence of light microscopy images, is a challenging task. Jug et al. [20] have proposed a mathematical abstraction of this task, the moral lineage tracing problem (MLTP) whose feasible solutions define a segmentation of every image and a lineage forest of cells. Their branch-and-cut algorithm, however, is prone to many cuts and slow convergences for large instances. To address this problem, we make three contributions: Firstly, we improve the branch-and-cut algorithm by separating tighter cutting planes. Secondly, we define two primal feasible local search algorithms for the MLTP. Thirdly, we show in experiments that our algorithms decrease the runtime on the problem instances of Jug et al. considerably and find solutions on larger instances in reasonable time.

1 Introduction

Recent advances in microscopy techniques have enabled biologists to observe organisms on a cellular level with higher spatio-temporal resolution than before [13, 17, 37]. Analysis of such microscopy sequences is key to several open questions in modern biology, including embryonic development of complex organisms [24, 25], tissue formation [18] or the understanding of metastatic behavior of tumor cells [43]. However, to get from vast amounts of raw microscopy images to biologically or clinically relevant quantities, such as cell motility, migration patterns and differentiation schedules, robust methods for cell lineage tracing are required and have therefore received considerable attention in the past [2, 3, 14, 29, 30, 31].

Typically, cell lineage tracing is considered a two step problem: In the first step, individual cells are detected and segmented in every frame. Then, in the second step, individual cells are tracked over time and, in case of a cell division, are linked to their ancestor cell, finally resulting in the lineage forest. The latter subproblem is complicated by cells that enter or leave the field of view, or low temporal resolution that allows large displacements or even multiple consecutive divisions within one time step. In addition to this, mistakes made in the first step, leading to over- or undersegmentation of the cells, propagate into the resulting lineage forest and cause spurious divisions or missing branches, respectively. The tracking subproblem is closely related to multi-target tracking [12, 36, 40] or reconstruction of tree-like structures [16, 33, 38, 39], with the most important difference that the objects can divide (only) into two. It is thus often cast as an optimization problem [21, 23, 32, 34, 35], dealing with some of the mentioned difficulties by being able to discard misdetections [23] or by providing and selecting from multiple detection hypotheses [34, 35].

Jug et al. [20], on the other hand, have proposed a rigorous mathematical abstraction for these two subtasks, the moral lineage tracing problem (MLTP). It is a hybrid of the minimum cost multicut problem (MCMCP) problem, which has been extensively studied for image decomposition [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 22, 27, 28, 41, 42], and the minimum cost disjoint arborescence problem, variations of which have been applied to reconstruct lineage forests in [21, 23, 32, 34, 35] or tree-like structures [16, 39, 38]. Feasible solutions to the MLTP define not only a valid cell lineage forest over time, but also a segmentation of the cells in every frame (cf. Fig. 1). Solving this optimization problem therefore tackles both subtasks – segmentation and
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tracking – simultaneously. While Jug et al. [20] demonstrate the advantages of their approach in terms of robustness, they also observe that their branch-and-cut algorithm (as well as their cutting-plane algorithm of the corresponding relaxation) is prone to a large number of cuts and exhibits slow convergence on large instances. That, unfortunately, prevents many potential use cases of the MLTP in practice, since it would be too computationally expensive.

**Contributions.** In this paper, we address this disadvantage. We make three contributions: Firstly, we improve the branch-and-cut algorithm of [20] by separating tighter cutting planes. Secondly, we devise two heuristics for the MLTP, both of which are primal feasible local search algorithms inspired by the heuristics of [27] for the MCMCP. Finally, we evaluate our algorithms on the problem instances of [20], where we show that our algorithms compare favorably against the original branch-and-cut algorithm, and on two additional, larger instances, where we are able to find near-optimal solutions in reasonable time.

## 2 Background and Preliminaries

Consider a set of \( \mathcal{T} = \{0, \ldots, t_{\text{end}}\} \) consecutive frames of microscopy image data. In moral lineage tracing, we seek to jointly segment the frames into cells and track the latter and their descendants over time. This problem is formulated by [20] as an integer linear program (ILP) with binary variables for all edges in an undirected graph as follows.

For each time index \( t \in \mathcal{T} \), the node set \( V_t \) contains all cell fragments, e.g. superpixels, in frame \( t \). Each neighboring pair of cell fragments is connected by an edge. The collection of such edges is denoted by \( E_t \). Between consecutive frames \( t \) and \( t+1 \), cell fragments that are sufficiently close to each other are connected by a (temporal) edge. The set of such inter frame edges is denoted by \( E_{t,t+1} \). By convention, we set \( V_{t_{\text{start}}+1} = E_{t_{\text{start}}+1} = E_{t_{\text{start}}-t_{\text{end}}+1} = \emptyset \).

The graph \( G = (V,E) \) with \( V = \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} V_t \) and \( E = \bigcup_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (E_t \cup E_{t,t+1}) \) is called hypothesis graph and illustrated in Fig. 1. For convenience, we further write \( G_t = (V_t, E_t) \) for the subgraph corresponding to frame \( t \) and \( G_t^+ = (V_t^+, E_t^+) \) with \( V_t^+ = V_t \cap V_{t+1} \) and \( E_t^+ = E_t \cup E_{t,t+1} \) for the subgraph corresponding to frames \( t \) and \( t+1 \).

For any hypothesis graph \( G = (V,E) \), a set \( L \subseteq E \) is called a **lineage cut of** \( G \) and, correspondingly, the subgraph \( (V,E \setminus L) \) is called a **lineage (sub)graph** of \( G \).

### 1. For every \( t \in \mathcal{T} \), the set \( E_t \cap L \) is a multicut\(^2\) of \( G_t \).

### 2. For every \( t \in \mathcal{T} \) and every \( \{v,w\} \in E_{t,t+1} \cap L \), the nodes \( v \) and \( w \) are not path-connected in the graph \((V_t^+, E_t^+ \setminus L)\).

### 3. For every \( t \in \mathcal{T} \) and nodes \( v_t, w_t \in V_t, v_{t+1}, w_{t+1} \in V_{t+1} \) with \( \{v_t, v_{t+1}\}, \{w_t, w_{t+1}\} \in E_{t,t+1} \setminus L \) and such that \( v_{t+1} \) and \( w_{t+1} \) are path-connected in \((V, E_{t+1} \setminus L)\), the nodes \( v_t \) and \( w_t \) are path-connected in \((V, E_t \setminus L)\).

\( \)\(^2\) A multicut of \( G_t = (V_t, E_t) \) is a subset \( M \subseteq E_t \) such that for every cycle \( C \) in \( G_t \) it holds that \([M \cap C] \neq 1\), cf. [15].

For any lineage graph \((V,E \setminus L)\) and every \( t \in \mathcal{T} \), the non-empty, maximal connected subgraphs of \((V_t, E_t \setminus L)\) are called **cells** at time index \( t \). Furthermore, Jug et al. call a lineage cut, respectively lineage graph, **binary** if it additionally satisfies

### 4. For every \( t \in \mathcal{T} \), every cell at time \( t \) is connected to at most two distinct cells at time \( t+1 \).

According to [20], any lineage graph well-defines a lineage forest of cells. Moreover, a lineage cut (and thus a lineage graph) can be encoded as a 01-labeling on the edges of the hypothesis graph.

**Lemma 1** ([20]). For every hypothesis graph \( G = (V,E) \) and every \( x \in \{0,1\}^E \), the set \( x^{-1}(1) \) of edges labeled 1 is a lineage cut of \( G \) iff \( x \) satisfies inequalities (1) – (3):

\[
\forall t \in \mathcal{T}, c \in \text{cycles}(G_t) \forall e \in C : \quad x_e \leq \sum_{e' \in C \setminus \{e\}} x_{e'} \tag{1}
\]

\[
\forall t \in \mathcal{T}, (v, w) \in E_{t,t+1} \forall P \in v-w-\text{paths}(G_t^+) : \quad x_{vw} \leq \sum_{e \in P} x_e \tag{2}
\]

\[
\forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \forall \{v_t, v_{t+1}\}, \{w_t, w_{t+1}\} \in E_{t,t+1} (v_t, w_t \in V_t) \forall S \in v_t w_t-\text{cuts}(G_t^+) \forall P \in v_t w_{t+1}-\text{paths}(G_{t+1}^+) : \quad 1 - \sum_{e \in S} (1 - x_e) \leq x_{v_t v_{t+1}} + x_{w_t w_{t+1}} + \sum_{e \in P} x_e \tag{3}
\]

Jug et al. refer to (1) as **space cycle**, to (2) as **space-time cycle** and to (3) as **morality constraints**. We denote by \( X_G \) the set of all \( x \in \{0,1\}^E \) that satisfy (1) – (3). For the formulation of the additional **bifurcation constraints**, which guarantee that the associated lineage cut is binary, we refer to ([20, Eq. 4]). The set \( X_G \) collects all \( x \in X_G \) that also satisfy the bifurcation constraints.

Given cut costs \( c : E \to \mathbb{R} \) on the edges as well as birth and termination costs \( c^+, c^- : V \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) on the vertices of the hypothesis graph, [20] defines the following **moral lineage tracing problem (MLTP)**

\[
\min_{x,v^+,v^-} \sum_{e \in E} c_e x_e + \sum_{v \in V} c_v^+ v^+_v + \sum_{v \in V} c_v^- v^-_v \tag{4}
\]

subject to

\[
x \in X_G, \quad x^+, x^- \in \{0,1\}^V, \quad (5)
\]

\[
\forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \forall \{v_t, v_{t+1}\} \forall S \in v_t v_{t+1}-\text{cuts}(G_t^+) : \quad 1 - x^+_v \leq \sum_{e \in S} (1 - x_e) \tag{6}
\]

\[
\forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \forall \{v_t, v_{t+1}\} \forall v \in v_t v_{t+1}-\text{cuts}(G_t^+) : \quad 1 - x^-_v \leq \sum_{e \in S} (1 - x_e) \tag{7}
\]

The inequalities (6) and (7) are called **birth** and **termination** constraints, respectively.

## 3 Improved Branch-and-cut Algorithm

Jug et al. propose to solve the MLTP with a branch-and-cut algorithm, for which they design separation procedures...
for (1) – (3), (6) – (7) and the bifurcation constraints. In the following, we propose several modifications of the constraints, which improve the performance of the optimization algorithm.

The authors of [20] pointed out that it is sufficient to consider only chordless cycles in (1) and, furthermore, it is well-known that chordless cycle inequalities are facet-defining for multicut polytopes (cf. [15] and [4]). However, this argument was not transferred to inequalities (2) and (3), which may be modified analogously.

Moreover, the inequalities of (3) where \( \{v_t, w_t\} \in E_t \) is an edge of the hypotetic graph may be considerably strengthened by a less trivial, yet simple modification. Lemma 2 shows that with both results combined, we can equivalently replace (1) – (3) by the set of tighter inequalities (8) and (9). In relation to our improved version of the branch-and-cut algorithm, we refer to (8) as cycle and to (9) as morality constraints.

**Lemma 2.** For every hypotetic graph \( G = (V, E) \) it holds that \( x \in X^*_G \) iff \( x \in \{0, 1\}^E \) and \( x \) satisfies

\[
\forall t \in \mathcal{V} \{v, w\} \in E_t \cup E_{t+1} \setminus \mathcal{P}
\forall \text{ chordless } \langle v, w \rangle \text{-path } P \text{ in } G_t^+:
\sum_{e \in P} x_e \leq 1 - \sum_{e \in E} (1 - x_e) \quad (8)
\]

Remark. Suppose we introduce for every pair of non-neighboring nodes \( v', w' \) in \( V_t \) a variable \( x_{v'w'} \) indicating whether \( v' \) and \( w' \) belong to the same cell \( (x_{v'w'} = 0) \) or not \( (x_{v'w'} = 1) \). Then any inequality of (9) is exactly the combination of a cut inequality \( 1 - x_{v'w'} \leq \sum_{e \in S} (1 - x_e) \) and a path inequality \( x_{v'w'} \leq \sum_{e \in P} x_e \) in the sense of lifted multicut ([4]). For neighboring nodes \( v, w \in V_t \), i.e., \( \{v, w\} \in E_t \), we have the variable \( x_{v,w} \) at hand and can thus omit the cut part of the morality constraint, as the lemma shows.

\[1 - \sum_{e \in S} (1 - x_e) \leq 1 - (1 - x_{v,w}) = x_{v,w},\]

we conclude that the inequalities (3) are implied by a combination of inequalities from (8) and (9).

**3.1 Termination and Birth Constraints**

We further suggest a strengthening of the birth and termination constraints in the MLTP. To this end, for any \( v \in V_{t+1} \) let \( V_t(v) = \{u \in V_t \mid \{u, v\} \in E_{t+1}\} \) be the set of neighboring nodes in frame \( t \). Further, we denote by \( E(V_t(v), V_{t+1}(v)) \) the set of inter frame edges that connect some node \( u_t \in V_t(v) \) with some node \( u_{t+1} \in V_{t+1}(v) \) different from \( v \).

**Lemma 3.** For every hypotetic graph \( G = (V, E) \), the vectors \( x \in X^*_G, x^+, x^- \in \{0, 1\}^V \) satisfy inequalities (6) iff the following inequalities hold:

\[
\forall t \in \mathcal{T} \forall v \in V_t \forall \mathcal{S} \subseteq V_t \setminus v \text{-cuts } (C_t^+):
1 - x_v^- \leq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{S} \setminus E(V_t(v), V_{t+1}(v))} (1 - x_e). \quad (10)
\]

Similarly, \( x \in X^*_G, x^+, x^- \in \{0, 1\}^V \) satisfy (7) iff

\[
\forall t \in \mathcal{T} \forall v \in V_t \forall \mathcal{S} \subseteq V_{t+1} \setminus v \text{-cuts } (C_t^+):
1 - x_v^- \leq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{S} \setminus E(V_t(v), V_{t+1}(v))} (1 - x_e). \quad (11)
\]

hold true.

**Proof.** We show the claim only for birth constraints since the proof for termination constraints is analogous. Let \( x \in X^*_G \) and \( x^+, x^- \in \{0, 1\}^V \). Apparently, if (10) is satisfied, then

\[
\sum_{e \in \mathcal{S}} (1 - x_e) \leq \sum_{e \in \mathcal{S}} (1 - x_e)
\]

implies that (6) also holds. Conversely, suppose (10) is violated. Then there exists some \( t \in \mathcal{T} \) and \( v \in V_{t+1}, \)
violates the inequality (6) is not violated, then there is a path $P$ in $G^+_t$ from some node in $V_t$ to $v$ with $x_P = 0$. Then $P$ must have non-empty intersection with $E(V_t(v), V_{t+1} \setminus \{v\})$. Let $u \in V_t(v)$ and $v' \in V_{t+1} \setminus \{v\}$ be such that $\{u, v'\} \in P$. Since $x_{uv} = 1$ it follows that $x$ violates the inequality

$$x_{uv} \leq \sum_{e \in P_{uv}} x_e$$

of (2) where $P_{uv}$ is the subpath of $P$ from $u$ to $v$. This is a contradiction to $x \in X_G'$.

3.2 Additional Odd Wheel Constraints

A wheel $W = (V(W), E(W))$ is a graph that consists of a cycle and a dedicated center node $w \in V(W)$ which is connected by an edge to every node in the cycle. Let $E_C$ denote the edges of $W$ in the cycle and $E_w$ the remaining center edges. With a wheel subgraph $W = (V(W), E(W))$ of a graph $G$ we may associate an inequality

$$\sum_{e \in E_C} x_e - \sum_{e \in E_w} x_e \leq \left\lfloor \frac{|V(W)| - 1}{2} \right\rfloor,$$

which is valid for multicut polytopes ([15]). A wheel is called odd if $|V(W)| - 1$ is odd. It is known that wheel inequalities are facet-defining for multicut polytopes iff the associated wheel is odd ([15]).

We propose to add additional odd wheel inequalities to the MLTP in order to strengthen the corresponding LP relaxation. More precisely, we consider only wheels $W = (V(W), E(W)) \subset G$ such that $w \in V_{t+1}$ and $v \in V_t$ for all $v \in V(W) \setminus w$ and some $t \in T$. This structure guarantees that for any $x \in X_G^t$, the restriction $x_{E(W)}$ is the incidence vector of a multicut of $W$. Therefore, (12) holds with respect to $x$.

3.3 Optimization Procedure

For a subset of the constraints, we use the commercial branch-and-cut solver Gurobi [19] to solve the LP relaxation and find integer feasible solutions. Whenever Gurobi finds an integer feasible solution $x$, we check whether $x \in X_G^t$ and all birth and termination constraints are satisfied. If not, then we provide Gurobi with an additional batch of violated inequalities from (8) – (11) as well as violated bifurcation constraints and repeat. To this end, we adapt the separation procedures of [20] to account for our improvements in a straightforward manner. We restrict ourselves to optionally add wheel inequalities for odd wheels with 4 nodes as described above (so-called 3-wheels) to the starting LP relaxation.

4 Local Search Algorithms

In this section, we introduce two local search heuristics for the MLTP. The first is a greedy agglomeration heuristic that is based on GAEC [27], which constructs a lineage in a bottom-up fashion. The second is a Kernighan-Lin-type algorithm [26] and an extension of KLj [27] (a heuristic for the MCMCP), which tries to improve a feasible lineage by greedily moving vertices between components. We adapt both to account for birth and termination costs, and to treat temporal edges differently than spatial edges, thus allowing a cell to be linked to two different cells in the successive time point.

Both algorithms maintain a decomposition of the graph $(V, \bigcup_{t \in T} E_t)$, ie. the components within each frame $G_t$ represent the cells. Let $V$ be the set of all cells. For each set of edges going from a component $a \in V$ at time point $t$ to a component $b$ at $t + 1$, we associate an arc $ab \in A$. This gives a directed graph $G = (V, A)$, as illustrated in Fig. 2. We write $V_a$ for the set of vertices $v$ in component $a \in V$ and $E_{ab}$ for the set of edges represented by arc $ab \in A$. They further maintain a selection of the arcs $A(y)$, where $y \in \{0, 1\}^A$, to represent which temporal edges are cut.

4.1 Greedy Lineage Agglomeration (GLA)

This algorithm, shown in Alg. 1, takes an MLTP instance and constructs a feasible lineage in a bottom-up fashion. Starting from $V = V$, it builds the lineage forest by either merging two components within an identical frame or selecting an arc $ab \in A$. The final selection of arcs then determines which temporal edges are cut edges $(x_e = 1)$. To do so, it maintains contracted edges between components within the same frame, denoted with $E$, along with $G = (V, A)$. The change in objective (4) caused by a particular move involving $a$ and $b$ is denoted with $\Delta_{\text{move}}$. The three allowed moves, merge, setParent and changeParent, are depicted in Fig. 3. In order to determine the cost or reward of a particular move, we have to examine not only the edge between the involved components $a$ and $b$, but also whether they have an associated parent or child cell already. For a merge, we have to consider arcs going to children or parents of either component, since they would be combined into an active arc and therefore change their state and affect the ob-
Operations that do not decrease the objective will be discarded. In contrast to the setting of a MCMCP, such local modifications affect the optimal parent-child relations between the (changed) components and thus, it becomes difficult to determine by how much the total objective (ideally) changes. To this end, we note that for a fixed intra-frame decomposition, determining the state of the temporal edges becomes a minimum cost branching problem (MCBP) on $G = (V, A)$. Therefore, both improveBipartition(…) and splitPartition(…) repeatedly solve an MCBP to determine the objective after an elementary move.

Minimum Cost Branching on $G$. For $G = (V, A)$ over a fixed decomposition into cells $V$, we formulate the MCBP with birth and termination costs and bifurcation constraint as an ILP:

$$\min \sum_{ab \in A} c_{ab} y_{ab} + \sum_{a \in V} c^{+}_a y^{+}_a + \sum_{a \in V} c^{-}_a y^{-}_a$$

subject to $\forall a \in V : (1 - y^{-}_a) = \sum_{b \in \delta^{-}(a)} y_{ba}$, (14)

$$\forall a \in V : (1 - y^{+}_a) \leq \sum_{b \in \delta^{+}(a)} y_{ab} \leq 2$$

$$y \in \{0, 1\}^A$$

where $y_{ab}$ indicates whether arc $ab$ is active ($y_{ab} = 1$) or not ($y_{ab} = 0$). The equality constraint (14) ensures that at most one incoming arc is selected (preventing a violation of morality) and, if none is chosen, the birth indicator $y^{-}_a$ is active. In the same sense, (15) enforces the penalty for termination if necessary, and its upper bound limits the number of children to 2, which enforces the bifurcation constraint. Note that $G$ is acyclic by construction, and we therefore do not require cycle elimination constraints. Observing that for $\forall e \in E_{ab} : 1 - y_{ab} = x_e$, ie. all edges in an arc need to have the same state to satisfy space-time constraints, we derive the weights $c_{ab} = -\sum_{e \in E_{ab}} c_e$. With a similar reasoning, all vertices of a component $a$ need to be in the same birth/termination state, $\forall v \in V_a : y^{+}_a = x^{+}_v$, hence we derive $c^{+}_a = \sum_{v \in V_a} c^{+}_v$ (and analogous for termination costs).

Algorithm 1 Greedy Lineage Agglomeration (GLA)

```
while progress do
  (a, b) ← arg min_{ab \in E \cup A} Δ^{\text{move}}_{ab}
  if Δ^{\text{move}} < 0 then
    applyMove(G, a, b) \triangleright updates partitions of $G$ and selects $A(y)$.
  else
    break
  end if
end while
return edgeLabels($G$) \triangleright cut-edge labeling $x^*$ from $V$ and $A(y)$.
```

Algorithm 2 KL with Optimal Branchings (KLB)

```
while progress do
  for $a, b \in V$ do
    if $\exists uv \in E_t : u \in V_a \land v \in V_b$ then
      continue
    end if
    improveBipartition($G, a, b$) \triangleright move nodes across border or merge.
  end for
  for $a \in V$ do
    splitPartition($G, a$) \triangleright split partition.
  end for
end while
return cutEdgeLabels($G$) \triangleright cut-edge labeling $x^*$ from $V$ and $A(y)$.
```

4.2 Kernighan-Lin with Optimal Branchings (KLB)

Algorithm 2 takes an MLTP instance and an initial decomposition, eg. the result of GLA, and attempts to decrease the objective function (4) in each step by changing the intra-frame partitions in a KL-fashion. Like the algorithm proposed by [27] for the related MCMCP, it explores three different local moves to decrease the objective function maximally: a) apply a sequence of $k$ node switches between two adjacent components $a$ and $b$, b) a complete merge of two components, and c) splitting a component into two.
The MLTP objective \( f_{\text{MLTP}} \) (4) can be split into two parts and directly calculated from the decomposition into cells and the temporal cut edges induced from \( y^* \), the optimal branching:

\[
f_{\text{MLTP}}(x^*) = \sum_{e \in \mathcal{U}_i \in \mathcal{T}} c_e x_e^* + \sum_{e \in \mathcal{U}_i \in \mathcal{T}} c_e + f_{\text{MCBP}}(y^*), \tag{17}
\]

where we identify the first two sums as the costs for the fixed decomposition with all temporal edges cut, and \( f_{\text{MCBP}}(y^*) \) corresponds to the achieved branching objective (13). The derivation is found in the supplements. This allows us to evaluate the change of objective of a move simply as the sum of partial changes from both decomposition and branching. For the latter, we note that for a given \( \mathcal{V} \), modifying two of its cells \( a \) and \( b \) in frame \( t \) will have relatively localized effects on \( y^* \). In particular, it only affects arcs that go from \( t - 1 \) to \( t \) and from \( t \) to \( t + 1 \), (their choice is independent from selected arcs in earlier or later frames when conditioned on \( \mathcal{V}_{t-1} \) and \( \mathcal{V}_{t+1} \)). In practice, we find that the effect is often also spatially localized, hence we optionally restrict ourselves to only update the MCBP in a range of \( d_{\text{MCB}} \) (undirected) arc hops of from \( a \) and \( b \). This parameter is instance dependent.

Implementation. The algorithm maintains the weighted \( \mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{A}) \), the objective corresponding to the intra-frame decomposition, ie. the first part of (17), and solves the MCBP on \( \mathcal{G} \) by the branch-and-cut algorithm implemented in [19]. In order to reduce the number of overall calculations in later iterations, we mark components that have changed and then, in the next iteration, attempt to improve only those pairs of components which involve at least one changed component. To account for changes that affect moves in previous or subsequent frames, we propagate these “changed” flags to all potential parents or children of a changed component.

5 Experiments & Results

Instances and Setup. We evaluate our algorithms on the two large instances of [20]: Flywing-epithelium and N2DL-HeLa-full. The hypothesis graph of the former instance consists of 5026 nodes and 19011 edges, while the latter consists of 10882 nodes and 19807 edges. In addition to this, we report experiments on two more sequences of a flywing epithelium time-lapse microscopy with a wider field of view. The corresponding hypothesis graphs consist of 10641 nodes and 42236 edges, respectively 76747 edges. We denote the data sets with Flywing-wide I and II. These instances are preprocessed with the same pipeline as Flywing-epithelium. For details on the preprocessing, we refer to [20].

Our choice of birth and termination costs follows [20], ie. we set \( c^* = c^+ = 5 \) for all instances. We initialize the KLB heuristic with the solution of GLA to decrease the number of outer iterations. We benchmark three versions of KLB: The first one solves the full MCBP in each turn and is denoted with KLB. The second, KLB-d=inf, exploits the described temporal locality and solves the MCBP within the (reachable) subgraph of \( t \pm 1 \), while the third, KLB-d=10, additionally exploits spatial locality (\( d_{\text{MCB}} = 10 \)).

We apply our improved branch-and-cut algorithm with and without additional 3-wheel constraints in order to evaluate the effect of the added inequalities. For the more extensive data sets Flywing-wide I and II we provide Gurobi with the objective value of the (quickly available) GLA solution to avoid separating poor integral points and accelerate fathoming within the branch-and-bound tree.

Convergence Analysis. The convergence of our algorithms in comparison to the branch-and-cut algorithm of [20] is reported in Fig. 4 and Table 1. We find that GLA is the fastest in all instances, but only reaches a local optimum with a gap of about 1.95% and 3.69%, respectively. This solution is improved by KLB in terms of objective, up to a gap of 0.76% and 1.86%. All three variants of KLB obtain the same solution in terms of cut-edge labeling, but those which exploit temporal locality, ie. KLB-d=inf and KLB-d=10, do so considerably faster. Considering spatial locality, on the other hand, does not improve runtime on these two instances. We find that KLB spends most of the time in the first outer iteration, where it has to check a large number of bipartitions that do not improve and will therefore not be considered in the next iteration. Our implementation of KLB currently only uses a single core, but could potentially be sped up by parallelization.

The improved branch-and-cut algorithm, denoted with tight-ILP and tight-ILP+3W (with additional 3-wheel constraints), retrieves feasible solutions considerably faster than the algorithm of [20] (original-ILP). For Flywing-epithelium, they reach the optimal solution in 74.5 s and 71 s, respectively, while the original algorithm took 4098 s. On N2DL-HeLa, the original-ILP found the optimal solution after 83929 s, and tight-ILP or tight-ILP+3W found it in 610 s and 827.5 s. In both cases, they provide tighter bounds, and the variant with 3-wheel constraints is even able to prove optimality of the solutions found for both instances. On a separate experiment with disabled bifurcation constraints, we found that tight-ILP+3W was able to prove optimality on Flywing-epithelium within 296 s and its solution does not violate any bifurcation constraint. As shown in Fig. 5, we observe that our modifications of the branch-and-cut greatly reduce the number of morality cuts.

On the larger instances Flywing-wide I and II, we present our results in Fig. 6. The branch-and-cut algorithms did not determine a feasible solution, but provide lower bounds. For the variant with 3-wheel constraints, these bounds are slightly tighter in both instances. Consequently, we are able to determine the maximal optimality gaps for GLA to be 2.9% (I) and 2.1% (II), and 1.3% (I) and 0.9% (II) for KLB. Again, all variants of KLB obtain identical solutions. On these instances, not only temporal locality helps to speed up the algorithm, but also spatial locality: KLB-d=inf reduces runtime from 9154.61 s to 1781.48 s (I) and from 28625.40 s to 10388.60 s (II), while KLB-d=10 re-
We compare the solution quality of our two heuristics by segmentation (SEG) and tracking (TRA) metrics as used in [30] for Flywing-epithelium. The results are reported in Table 2. We observe that KLB improves the scores of GLA slightly (up to an additional 1.2% and 0.81% for SEG and TRA, respectively). The (optimal) solutions of the original and the improved branch-and-cut algorithm are identical, and achieve slightly better scores in both measures than the heuristics. All presented algorithms outperform the baseline, the packing analyzer [1], a typical cell tracking tool used by biologists whose scores were originally reported in [20].

Figure 5 Number of morality cuts (top), ie. (3) or (9), and cycle cuts (bottom), ie. (1) and (2) or (8), separated in the different branch-and-cut algorithms. We observe that our algorithms, tight-ILP and tight-ILP+3W, require considerably fewer morality cuts, while the number of cycle cuts (including both space-cycles and space-time-cycles) is in the same order of magnitude.

Figure 6 Results on the more extensive instances Flywing-wide I and II. The branch-and-cut algorithm with 3-wheel constraints provides slightly tighter bounds, with which we determine the gaps for GLA to be 2.9% (I) and 2.1% (II), and 1.3% (I) and 0.9% (II) for KLB. Exploiting temporal and spatial locality when re-solving the MCBP considerably reduces runtime of KLB.

Figure 7 Depicted above are (a) three representative and consecutive time points of Flywing-wide I, (b) corresponding decompositions of these images into cell fragments, and (c) decompositions of the images defined by a feasible solution of the moral lineage tracing problem. The white edges in (c) are the outlines of gold standard human lineage annotation, added here for simplified comparison.

6 Conclusion

In this work, we addressed efficient algorithms for the recently introduced MLTP [20], a mathematical framework for cell lineage reconstruction, which treats both subproblems, image decomposition and tracking, jointly. We have improved the branch-and-cut algorithm of [20] by separating tighter cutting planes. Furthermore, we proposed two heuristics for MLTP: a fast agglomerative procedure called GLA that constructs a feasible lineage in a bottom-up fashion, and a variant of the KL-algorithm which attempts to improve a given lineage by switching nodes between components, merging or splitting them, and repeatedly solves a MCBP conditioned on fixed partitions. Our algorithms find exact solutions for previous instances up to two orders of magnitude faster and produce near-optimal solutions for wider instances in reasonable time. This empirically demonstrates that our methods alleviate runtime issues with MLTP instances and improve the applicability of moral lineage tracing in practice.
Table 1: Detailed quantitative comparison of algorithms for the MLTP. BestGap is calculated using the tightest bound of any algorithm, while Gap is based on the bound established by each particular algorithm. We limit the runtime of tight-ILP to approximately the time it took tight-ILP+3W to prove optimality. KLB solves the full branching problem in every turn, while KLB-d=inf utilizes temporal locality and KLB-d=10 additionally uses spatial locality with $d_{SICBP} = 10$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Flying-epithelium</th>
<th>N2DL-HeLa-full</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time / s</td>
<td>objBest</td>
<td>objBound</td>
<td>Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-38835.90</td>
<td>0.0195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLB</td>
<td>546.32</td>
<td>-39294.65</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>1025.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLB-d=10</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>-39294.65</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tight-ILP</td>
<td>2214.06</td>
<td>-39593.90</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>16627.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tight-ILP+3W</td>
<td>1696.80</td>
<td>-39593.90</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>15780.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>original-ILP</td>
<td>23460.80</td>
<td>-39593.90</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
<td>1696.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Comparison of the distance from ground truth of segmentation (SEG) and traced lineage forest (TRA) on Flying-epithelium. ILP denotes the result of the branch-and-cut algorithm, while PA [1] is a common tracking tool used by biologists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>SEG</th>
<th>TRA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLA</td>
<td>0.9363</td>
<td>0.9640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLB</td>
<td>0.9485</td>
<td>0.9721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILP</td>
<td>0.9722</td>
<td>0.9813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA (auto)</td>
<td>0.7980</td>
<td>0.9206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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